

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/253,048	02/19/1999	YASUHITO INAGAKI	9792909-4094	5170	
	7590 08/11/2004		EXAM	INER	
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL 8000 SEARS TOWER			MARKOFF, A	MARKOFF, ALEXANDER	
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6404			1746		

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				10			
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	(
		09/253,048	INAGAKI ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Alexander Markoff	1746				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address				
THE - External control	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply D period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.			
Status							
1)[🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Ju	ine 2004					
		action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>42-51 and 54</u> is/are pending in the appear of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>42-51 and 54</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.					
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the B	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	∋ 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-			(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)[_ a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachmen	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	ite atent Application (PTO-152)				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 09/253,048

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/21/04 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Rejection of claims 42-48, 50 and 51 made in the previous Office action under 35
 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite because the terms "the hydrolyzed polymer" and "the hydrolyzed polymer said agent" lack proper antecedent basis.

Application/Control Number: 09/253,048 Page 3

Art Unit: 1746

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. Claims 42-51 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of EP 0818474, EP 0818420 and Inagaki et al in view of DE 4444032, Elfine, Monick et al, Horton and Ramirez et al.

This rejection was previously applied for claims 42-53. The rejection is maintained for the claims 42-51 and applied for newly added claim 54 for the reasons indicated in the previous Office action.

Application/Control Number: 09/253,048

Art Unit: 1746

As to the newly added limitation requiring the specific range for styrene or/and conjugated diene: the primary references disclose such range. See at least columns 17 and 18 of Inagaki et al and page 3 of EP 0818420.

As to newly added limitations requiring I introducing hydrophilic groups and ion groups: The primary documents teach introducing the same reagents to the same resins as in the specification of the instant application. The obtained polyelectrolytes are the same as claimed cleaning agents.

Newly added claim 54 requires the use of hydrolyzed polymer obtained by polymerization of monomers of acrylonitrile, styrene and conjugated diene. This is disclosed by the primary references.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 6/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It noted that the applicants again argue that Inagaki et al do not teach a polymer composition made from acrylonitrile and conjugated diene.

This is not persuasive because in contrast to the applicant's statement the documents clearly teach this and even lists the specifically claimed resins as preferred.

See column 4, line 46 – column 5, line 8 and the other parts of the Detailed Description.

It is noted that applicants individually argue some of the references used in the rejection. It is noted that the applicants failed to provide any arguments regarding the teachings of EP 0818474, EP 0818420, DE 4444032 and Horton.

Application/Control Number: 09/253,048

Art Unit: 1746

Page 5

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Markoff whose telephone number is 571-272-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alexander Markoff Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1746

am